DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 343 938 TM 018 101

TITLE	Annual Report of the State Alternative Assessment Exchange (AKA Student Assessment Consortia). Project 1.1: Fostering Collaboration.
INSTITUTION	Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing, Los Angeles, CA.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Feb 92
CONTRACT	R117G10027
NOTE	27p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Art Education; *Consortia; Curriculum Development; *Educational Assessment; Educational Cooperation; *Educational Innovation; Elementary Secondary Education; Employment Potential; Mathematics Tests; Reading Tests; *Shared Resources and Services; Social Studies; Specialists; *State Programs; *Student Evaluation; Testing Programs; Writing Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS	*Student Assessment Consortium

ABSTRACT

The Student Assessment Consortium (SAC), a collaboration between the Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing and the Council of Chief State School Officers, was created to facilitate innovative assessment work in several subject areas. Its purpose is to share expertise and information about the development of innovative student assessment programs, share actual assessment measures, and begin to build clusters of states for student assessment that is at the heart of several proposals for national assessment programs. The work of the SAC is accomplished through various technical working groups that are formed when two or more states determine that they wish to work together in the development of assessment resources. States are invited to join. The core of each working group is state-level curriculum and assessment specialists, but other specialists in the content area are invited to join. In the first year of the project, SACs were initiated in six areas, with organizational meetings held on October 26, 1991 in Des Moines (Iowa). An individual report, with a summary of accomplishments, is provided for each of the following SAC areas: (1) mathematics; (2) reading; (3) writing; (4) arts education; (5) social studies; and (6) workplace readiness. Two sample assessment instruments are included. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED343938

National Center for Research on
Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing

Final Deliverable – February 1992

Project 1.1: Fostering Collaboration

Annual Report of the State Alternative Assessment Exchange

(AKA Student Assessment Consortia)

Project Directors:
Joan L. Herman, CRESST/University of California, Los Angeles
Edward D. Roeber, Council of Chief State School Officers

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
Grant No. R117G10027 CFDA Catalog No. 84.117G

Center for the Study of Evaluation
Graduate School of Education
University of California, Los Angeles
Los Angeles, CA 90024-1522
(310) 206-1532

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TM018101

The work reported herein was supported under the Educational Research and Development Center Program cooperative agreement R117G10027 and CFDA catalog number 84.117G as administered by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.

The findings and opinions expressed in this report do not reflect the position or policies of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement or the U.S. Department of Education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Mathematics Student Assessment Consortium	3
Reading Student Assessment Consortium	5
Writing Student Assessment Consortium	7
Arts Education Assessment Consortium	11
Social Studies Assessment Consortium	15
Workplace Readiness Student Assessment Consortium	23

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE STATE ALTERNATIVE ASSESSMENT EXCHANGE

(AKA STUDENT ASSESSMENT CONSORTIA)

Project Directors:

Joan L. Herman, CRESST/University of California, Los Angeles

Edward D. Roeber, Council of Chief State School Officers

INTRODUCTION

The Student Assessment Consortium, a collaboration between CRESST and the Council of Chief State School Officers, was created to facilitate innovative assessment work in several subject areas. The purpose of the Student Assessment Consortium is to share expertise and information about the development of innovative student assessment programs, share actual assessment measures, and begin to build the clusters of states for student assessment that is at the heart of several of the proposals for national examination programs.

Objectives

The specific objectives of the Student Assessment Consortium include:

1. Assist states in articulating their vision and guiding principles for state assessment systems that facilitate educational reform;
2. Assist policymakers to understand the advantages and disadvantages of various options for student assessment systems;
3. Provide information and advice to policymakers and others on student assessment systems;
4. Promote the exchange of ideas and information about student assessment among state educational leaders and others;
5. Facilitate the joint development and pooling of assessment exercises and strategies;

6. Foster collaborative agreements and joint research and development activities on behalf of the states and others.

Working Group Structure

The work of the Student Assessment Consortium is accomplished through various technical working groups which are formed when two or more states determine that they wish to work together in the development of assessment resources. The resources to be developed jointly may include assessment frameworks, assessment tasks or exercises in various areas, training packages to assist others in developing, using or reporting assessments at various levels, or materials developed to meet other common needs.

States with an interest in the work of the Student Assessment Consortium were invited to join one or more working groups. To join a working group, both a curriculum and an assessment specialist were to be nominated and supported by the state superintendent. Each working group was to be comprised of the curriculum and assessment specialists most interested and qualified for the work to be carried out. Other state-level specialists relevant to the nature of the group (e.g., professional development specialists) were to be added to the group as needed.

While it was anticipated that the core of each working group was to be made up of state-level curriculum and assessment specialists, the group invited other specialists in the content area to join the group. These individuals came from state agencies, school districts, colleges and universities, non-profit organizations, research centers, regional laboratories or other organizations. The intent was to form relatively small working groups (e.g., 50 persons or less) made up of the key individuals in each area of work.

During the first year of the project, Student Assessment Consortia were initiated in six areas: mathematics, reading, writing, the arts, history, and workplace readiness. States interested in participating in one or more of these working groups were invited to attend an organizational meeting held October 26, 1991 in Des Moines, Iowa. A report of the status of each of these groups is contained in the sections that follow.

Mathematics Student Assessment Consortium

Report of Discussion and Actions

October 26, 1991

Norman Webb, Group Leader

National Center for Research in the Mathematical Sciences

The discussion of the 19-member group—representing twelve states, one territory, two commercial testing companies, one educational laboratory, and one research center—divided into three areas. First, the group spent time getting acquainted by sharing their purposes for attending the consortium meeting and what they and their states or agencies were engaged in doing. Second, the group brainstormed possible ways that members could cooperate with each other. Ideas generated included:

1. Help define student outcomes and how to translate these into assessment activities;
2. Share tasks;
3. Engage in joint exercise development;
4. Validate each other's assessment approaches;
5. Develop exemplary tasks;
6. Help standardize language of mathematics assessment; and,
7. Generate ideas for educating teachers about student assessment.

Third, the group turned toward finding ways to make cooperation among those present and others actually happen.

The discussion on making cooperation a reality identified several constraints that the group tried to think through. Members realized that for there to be productive cooperation, work had to be based on common problems. One constraint was the wide variance in the use of assessment by the different states represented. One state viewed assessment as driving reform while another state was required to have the assessment based on the syllabus. Some states have entrenched assessment programs with a long history, while

other states are looking toward the "next generation" of assessment. Some states have mandated assessment programs, while others have small or no state assessment programs. Some states are mandated to build into the assessment certain features, such as diagnosis or monitoring student progress, while other states are required to monitor district or state progress. Some states are interested in regional assessments, while others are only interested in within-state information. Finally, while those present and their working parts at the state level seem well attuned the *NCTM Curriculum and Evaluation Standards*, members of the group expressed large differences in the degree to which teachers in their state are familiar with and believe in the *Standards*. Some members from less populated states felt a very high percentage of teachers were knowledgeable about the *Standards*. Those from other states reported that only a small percentage of teachers had even heard about the *Standards*.

As we tried to work with these many significant differences, and as we realized that underlying meaningful cooperation required mutual benefit to all parties, we decided on two next steps. First, we needed to identify those in the group who had common problems. Members of the group are to send by November 15, to Norman Webb at the NCRMS, a brief description of their assessment plans for the year, issues and problems they are facing, and a wish list of what they need. The NCRMS will then send these to members of the Mathematics Consortium and others who request this information. Second, to help stay in touch, two luncheon meetings are planned for members to continue their dialogue with each other. One will be April 1 at the NCTM meeting in Nashville, Tennessee (John Sutton will make the arrangements). The other will be April 22 at AERA in San Francisco, California (Norman Webb will make the arrangements).

Reading Student Assessment Consortium

Report of Discussion and Actions

October 26, 1991

The reading group included representatives from Arizona, Iowa, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Texas. Illinois and Michigan sent materials. Dr. Thomas F. Sherman of Winona State University represented the International Reading Association (IRA).

Each state representative described the state's interest in the consortium, status of test development, and potential resources available.

- Arizona uses both standardized, norm-referenced tests and performance assessments for reading (also writing and math) at grades 3, 8, and 12. The curriculum-referenced performance assessments match Arizona essential skills both in content (the "what") and also in terms of context (the "how" or processes of the skills). These assessments were developed with the Riverside Publishing Company; while Arizona is free to share design features and prototypes, Riverside holds the copyrights on passages and items.

- Iowa has no formal statewide assessment program, but leadership has been talking about starting one. They do have state standards and do monitor districts' compliance with these standards.

- Recent legislation in North Dakota mandated the establishment of performance standards and assessment measures of those standards. Broad outcomes will be developed, as well as the standards, for grades, 4, 8, and 11. In addition, North Dakota mandates the use of the CTBS. North Dakota is interested in looking at curricular frameworks and outcome-based assessments.

- Pennsylvania is moving away from the individual-based assessment, TELLS, to a school-based, matrix sampling assessment of reading at grades 5, 8, and 11 (as well as math and a writing sample in grades 6 and 9). They have adopted whole-language reading assessment. The state will soon adopt outcome-based instruction for 15 goal areas. School districts will need performance assessments and portfolios to measure success in the outcomes. Therefore, Pennsylvania is in dire need of test items and has few items available for sharing.

- South Carolina is doing both criterion-referenced and norm-referenced testing covering almost all grade levels. The CRT, the Basic Skills Assessment Program (BSAP), has a multiple-choice reading test. The

NRT is Stanford-8. Both tests are secure. South Carolina is in the midst of a major effort to develop statewide curriculum and assessment frameworks. Preliminary prototypes in various formats, including multiple-choice, constructed response, and free response, have been developed and will be used as resources for the curriculum and assessment development teams.

- Texas is currently using a criterion-referenced program, TAAS, at grades 3, 5 7, 9, and 11. Demand for critical reading and higher-order thinking receive increased emphasis as grade level increases. Students' reading ability is assessed in a variety of contexts including narrative and content area passages as well as graphic, real-world documents. TAAS is multiple-choice, but the addition of performance assessments that integrate reading with other content areas is being considered.

The reading group discussed the conflict between the need for good performance assessments in the classroom and the external demands for accountability. How can locally developed portfolios and criteria be used for accountability? The reading group felt that all implementation documents, regardless of the framework, should be "user friendly." We also questioned how one motivates districts to initiate change when test scores are "high" or assessment programs are not established. All agreed that, although it is not the best way, assessment is probably the fastest way to stir action in curriculum or process change.

The reading group discussed the role of professional organizations in the establishment of standards for reading. NCTE and IRA should work together to form a consensus. Initially, group participants will share state curricular reading frameworks with each other. In addition, the reading group will poll all states for reading frameworks. The reading group hopes to establish an electronic communication system to share outcome statements and performance items. We must also work on recruiting more members. The next reading meeting will probably be with the International Reading Association meeting in Florida in early May. Barb Kapinus of Maryland will chair the group and act as convener.

It was also found that there are other assessment issues that states have in common. For example, Pennsylvania's "school profiles" are very close to Arizona's reports. It was suggested that CCSSO convene meetings on special topics such as reporting procedures, security, testing procedures, etc.

Writing Student Assessment Consortium

Report of Discussion and Actions

October 26, 1991

Patricia Porter, Group Leader

Texas Education Agency

Participants

Arkansas Department of Education	Gayle Teal
California Assessment Collaborative	Kate Jamintz
Center for Educational Testing and Evaluation	John Poggio
Illinois State Board of Education	Carmen Chapman
Kentucky Department of Education	Ed Reidy
Louisiana Department of Education	Arthur Halbrook
Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory	John Kendall
New Mexico Department of Education	Patricia Rael
New York State Education Department	Mary Carrado
New York State Education Department	Charles Chew
Texas Education Agency	Patricia Porter (Convener)
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction	John Fortier

Summary of Discussions

To begin group interaction, each participant was asked why he or she was interested in forming an interstate writing consortium. In general, participants viewed the consortium as a "sounding board" for ideas, especially needed since many of the state programs are changing rapidly from traditional, one-time snapshot assessments to those focusing on portfolios, group activities, and integrated tasks.

Many of the participants were interested in pursuing joint item development and field testing activities with another state or cluster of states. Several states were interested in making use of the writing prompt bank developed by the National Writing Consortium, an informal group of more than 20 states that meets annually to share ideas and research in the area of writing assessments. Information on the prompt bank will be sent to all participants in the CCSSO consortium.

Participants expressed a strong desire to work with other subject area consortia to develop tasks combining writing with one or more of the other subject areas. Participants were interested in sharing their materials, such as scoring rubrics, training materials, or reports, with other participants. It was recommended that each member state send a list of its materials to the CCSSO, which will serve as a clearinghouse by distributing the lists and an explanatory letter to each participant. Members could order desired materials from the appropriate state.

Participants expressed a great deal of interest in portfolio assessment and the need to collaborate with other states to cut development and field-test costs and to provide expanded sources for ideas. Consortium members discussed desired attributes of portfolios. The group expressed a preference for interdisciplinary portfolios that were organized around a central theme, such as an environmental or social issue. One component of these portfolios, especially at the high school level, might be data analysis and research in areas such as science, social studies, and mathematics. Another component might be geared more toward human emotion and include elements such as interviews, projects in the arts and the humanities, and tasks related to communication, for example, "acting out" situations and retelling stories, which would be especially desirable at the elementary level.

Participants believed that in designing portfolios, special attention must be paid to differences in student populations. Some elements in portfolios should be self-selected and self-monitored. In certain tasks students should be able to choose their own medium of expression, whether it be a written piece, an oral presentation, a work of art, a graphic, or quantitative evidence. Some tasks should include group work, and others should be individual. Regardless

of the task, the participants believed that clear standards for performance should be established and communicated to students.

Participants recommended that portfolio tasks with differing degrees of complexity be field tested to provide more definitive information in the construction of portfolios. Consortium members recommended that cross-disciplinary teams should score the portfolios and that community input should be elicited in the design of scoring models and rubrics. Many participants indicated a willingness to collaborate in the development and piloting of interdisciplinary portfolios.

Consortium Plans

Even though at the time very few participants were planning to attend the January Association of State Assessment Program (ASAP) meeting in New Orleans, the consortium tentatively decided to meet there on January 21, 1992, which is the day preceding the ASAP meeting. More definitive plans for collaboration among member states will be discussed at the January meeting. Several participants agreed to take responsibility for certain tasks identified by the group. Gayle Teal will be in charge of information sharing among consortium members and will produce a newsletter. Dan Resnick and John Kendall agreed to develop a design for portfolios. Pat Porter will provide information to participants about the prompt bank. In addition, Pat has agreed to serve as convener for this group.

Arts Education Assessment Consortium

Report of Discussion and Actions

October 26, 1991

Joan Peterson, Group Leader

California State Department of Education

The following 10 states, in addition to the territory of Samoa, sent representatives to the Student Assessment Consortium on October 26 in Des Moines: Arkansas, California, Colorado, Iowa, Michigan, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington and Wyoming. Representatives included arts education consultants, a deputy superintendent, a curriculum consultant, a representative from a regional lab, and the educator responsible for developing "Samoa 2000."

There was lively discussion on issues surrounding assessment in the arts. The group began by sharing information on past activity in arts assessment in their states and efforts currently underway to initiate or develop assessment strategies in the arts. The majority of the states represented were focusing on identifying what students should know and be able to do in the arts, which were described in various terms. Phrases like learner outcomes, student achievement outcomes, outcomes-based grade level objective, and exit outcomes were used along with program standards, standards of learning, content standards and core concepts. The members of the Arts Education Assessment Consortium thus agreed that a major step in our work together was to develop a common definition of terms used to describe arts assessment.

Additional discussion confirmed that, along with developing common language, reaching consensus on desired outcomes or content standards was important. Thus was organized the Curricular Framework Consensus Project to define a common vision of arts education based on a review and analysis of current state frameworks. While no two states may have exactly the same names or terms for the divisions of content, the goal was to identify the commonalties and differences exemplified by the frameworks. The term "curricular" was defined as the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values

expected to be learned by students rather than a definition which might include a listing of courses or programs.

Each of the 10 Arts Education Assessment Consortium members will contact five states, requesting a copy of their visual and performing arts framework to analyze in terms of commonalties and differences. Frank Phillip (Michigan) proposed a matrix that would help to define the major content categories of the frameworks being reviewed. Members of the Consortium will analyze their five assigned state frameworks, sharing their analysis with the state's arts consultants to gain additional input and assure that they have represented the state's documents accurately. That information will then be forwarded to Joan Peterson, convener of the Arts Education Assessment Consortium. A preliminary summary of the collected information will be presented at the arts assessment invitational symposium, December 4-6, sponsored by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) in Washington, DC.

The Arts Education Assessment Consortium is surveying members to find an already-calendered conference that a majority will be attending at which to schedule the next Consortium meeting, which will expand to include the Arts Assessment Committee members of the National Council of State Arts Education Consultants. At that meeting, members will review data collected on the major framework categories and begin to define student outcome expectancies, that is, what we would expect students to KNOW about the arts, what we would expect students to BE ABLE TO DO in the arts, and what are the ATTITUDES AND VALUES that should be expected as a result of education in the arts.

The Curricular Framework Consensus Project is predicated on the following basic assumptions:

- All children need experiences in arts education for basic human development, and thus, arts are an essential part of Goal #3 in *American 2000.*
- All children can and should learn and develop knowledge, skills, and understandings in arts education.
- There are appropriate and authentic ways to measure these expectations.

- Traditional ways of assessing the arts provide existing models of authentic assessment for other content areas.

- There seems to be substantial preliminary agreement about the expected outcomes and the content of arts education as evidenced by a cursory review of numerous state frameworks and similar curriculum documents.

- National professional organizations have defined expectations for their specific arts, but there is not a broader national vision.

- The recent formation of the National Council of State Arts Education Consultants (NCSAEC) provides a bridge between the various arts education content areas and national, state and local arts education issues and concerns. The new NCSAEC can thus serve as a conduit of information for helping to coordinate a national vision of arts education.

- While a national vision and national standards for arts education are appropriate and vitally needed for assuring that arts education becomes part of the nationally recognized core curriculum for all students, a national test is not an appropriate or feasible goal. Assessment measures should be developed by individual states or a consortium of states and should include teacher involvement and student feedback.

Social Studies Assessment Consortium

Report of Discussion and Actions

October 26, 1991

Pamela Aschbacher, Group Leader

National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing

The first meeting of the Social Studies Assessment Consortium (SSAC) was held in Des Moines, Iowa, on October 26. The group was one of the six convened by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) to encourage cooperative development of alternative methods of large-scale student assessment in several content areas. Fifteen people attended the history group, including assessment officers from 10 states (Alabama, California, Connecticut, Hawaii, Iowa, Nebraska, New Jersey, North Dakota, Texas, and Washington) and American Samoa. Representatives from the Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards and Student Testing (CRESST), Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory (McREL) and a Michigan regional office also participated.

Much of the morning session was devoted to a discussion of state goals in history and social studies. Out of this discussion came the consensus to expand the original focus of the group from history to the broader area of social studies, since most of the states represented have or are developing curriculum frameworks that address the social studies. Furthermore, members of the group wanted to resist pressures (both local and national) to fractionate curriculum and assessment practices. Rather, we wanted to push for integrated use of knowledge and skills across the disciplines and to support the shift in goals from education for personal success to education for contributions to society and the planet. The group wants to address not only content knowledge but also process and metacognitive skills, and values.

Members of the group shared their experiences and priorities in social studies assessment. Some states have recently revised curricular frameworks while others are just now developing new frameworks. Several states are planning statewide alternative assessments in social studies, but others plan

to provide assistance to local districts for development of assessments. A few states have tried some alternative assessments methods, such as enhanced multiple-choice, short answer, and essays, but a few others are still at the stage of specifying student outcomes. Group members expressed interest in sharing both curricular frameworks and assessment plans and materials in greater detail at later meetings.

During the afternoon the group developed a common format to summarize each state's curriculum framework and assessment program and plans to facilitate our sharing of basic information prior to the next meeting. Pam Aschbacher (CRESST) volunteered to draft the forms based on group notes and send them to participants for review. Then participants will complete revised forms for their state and send a copy to each of the others in the group.

Although the CCSSO had suggested that the assessment consortia meet quarterly, the SSAC group agreed that two 2-day meetings a year would be more feasible. The group acknowledged serious fiscal constraints on interstate travel and felt it would also be difficult to meet at large meetings such as AERA or the ESC/CDE assessment conference because of time constraints and other reasons. Thus, we agreed to try to arrange a special two-day meeting for our group in Winter 1992. Two possible sites were discussed and will be investigated: Hawaii and Colorado. The agenda for this meeting will include the following items: identify framework commonalties; share alternative assessment plans, ideas, examples; consider policy and operation issues for the group; and consider sources of funds to support group meetings.

Ed Roeber (CCSSO) will send this summary of our work to social studies consultants and specialists, inviting them to participate in future work. We will also contact others who can provide valuable expertise to the group. For more information, contact Pam Aschbacher, UCLA/CRESST, 405 Hilgard Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90024-1522; (310) 206-1532.

MEMO

TO: Social Studies Assessment Consortium

FROM: Pam Aschbacher

DATE: 1-2-92

SUBJECT: Revised curriculum and assessment survey & next meeting

SURVEY: Since hearing from several people I've revised the enclosed forms slightly. **Please complete them and send a copy to everyone on the enclosed mailing list ASAP**. Note that a few names have been added since I sent you mailing address labels with the previous memo. (If you have already completed copies of the previous forms and mailed them out, don't bother to re-do with this new version.)

NEXT MEETING: For a variety of reasons, I suggest we hold the next meeting of our group in Los Angeles at our CRESST offices in Westwood on Thursday and Friday, March 12-13. (Colorado or Hawaii may be next.) I hope a few LA-based social studies experts will participate in our meeting. I'll mail you information on possible places to stay, and you can make your own reservations. I suggest we meet briefly Thursday evening (e.g., 6-7 pm) and all day Friday, which gives you the option of going home Friday night or staying Saturday night for a cheaper fare or to see friends here.

Please let me know ASAP whether you (or a colleague) will attend, so we can postpone the meeting if no one can come. PHONE: 310-206-1532; FAX: 310-825-3883.

Agenda

- Define our ultimate objective (e.g., do we want to identify one or more common areas in which to co-develop alternative assessments? what areas? what does co-development mean?)
- Decide on policy and operation guidelines for group (e.g., ownership of new assessments)
- Identify assessment (and framework) commonalties
- Share alternative assessment development plans, ideas, examples
- Outline development plans (who will do what)
- Discuss how assessments should/could differ and relate at various education levels (e.g., classroom, district, state and regional levels)
- Discuss how alternative assessments can relate to multiple choice measures
- Plan for future: next meeting time and place; how to get $ to support further group meetings and communications

State:_____

Council of Chief State School Officers
State Curriculum Framework
in Social Studies Assessment Consortium
Version 2
Report of Discussion and Actions
October 26, 1991

Summary of the:

1. Guiding Assumptions (beliefs, philosophy about what students should know, value, be)

2. Areas of Student Outcome Goals (enter grade levels at which these are recommended)

Topics or areas of focus:	Content knowledge: facts, vocab, procedures	Thinking, writing, discourse skills	Attitudes, dispositions, self-monitoring	Community participation
history US state European others:				
world cultures				
geography				
economics				
govt/civics/law				
citizenship				
current events				
sociology				
psychology				
anthropology				
integrated disciplines (describe: _____)				
others:				

3. Do you have a state mandate or requirement (versus much local control and flexibility) over what is in the curriculum and when it is covered? (describe)

4. Describe those students, if any, to whom these curricular goals are **not** intended to apply (age/grades; LEP, special ed; etc.)

5. Describe the development of this social studies framework:

When was it developed or last revised?_____ When next revision?_____
Who were the key participants in its development?

What was the process they went through?

How long did it take to develop?

Approximately how much did it cost the state to develop it?

6. What other information about your framework do you feel other states should know?

State: _____

Council of Chief State School Officers
Summary of State Assessment Program
In Social Studies
Version 2
Report of Discussion and Actions
October 26, 1991

1. What types of tests or indicators do you **now use**? (write grade levels in appropriate squares)

	Type of Student Response			
	Multiple Choice	Brief Open-ended	Essay	Hands-on, Oral, Portfolio, etc.
U.S. History				
State History				
European History				
World Cultures				
Geography				
Economics				
Govt/civics/law				
Citizenship				
Current events				
Social, Psych, Anthro				
Integrated disciplines within social studies				
Social studies integrated w/ other subjects				

2. In the chart above, **put a P in the boxes** to indicate the areas in which you are **developing or would like to develop** alternative assessments

3. In which areas, if any, do you plan to **drop existing tests**?

Please respond **twice** to the questions below: one column is for your current assessment program in social studies (if you have one) and one is for your plans or wishes for future assessment in social studies. Check all that apply.

	Current Assessment:	**Future Plans/Wishes:**
4. Which students NOT tested?	[ ] LEP [ ] special ed [ ] other: ____	[ ] LEP [ ] spec ed [ ] other
5. Whom do you test ?	[ ] all students [ ] a sample of students?	[ ] all students [ ] a sample
6. What does each student do?	[ ] all items/tasks [ ] a sample of items/tasks?	[ ] all tasks [ ] a sample
7. When is test administered?	[ ] fall [ ] spring	[ ] fall [ ] spring
8. How do students work?	[ ] individually [ ] as a group	[ ] individually [ ] as a group
9. Who is scored?	[ ] the individual [ ] the group	[ ] individual [ ] group
10. Who does scoring?	[ ] commercial company [ ] teachers	[ ] commercial [ ] teachers
11. Hours of rater training needed:	_____ hrs/rater	_____ hrs/rater
12. Total number of raters used	_____ raters	_____ raters

13. Briefly describe your scoring rubrics for performance-based assessments (current and plans if you have any yet).

14. Describe standards or cut scores for evaluating student performance (current and plans).

15. Describe any efforts to establish content validity:

16. At what levels are the data reported and to whom?

Levels:	**To Whom Reported Now:**	**To Whom Will Report:**
state	_____	_____
district	_____	_____
school	_____	_____
classroom	_____	_____
individual student	_____	_____
other	_____	_____

17. What are the consequences (positive or negative) of social studies test results for

	Current:	Future:
districts	_____	_____
schools	_____	_____
teachers	_____	_____
students	_____	_____
others	_____	_____

18. Are assessment results used to alter curriculum and/or instruction?

Current:	Future:
[ ] yes	[ ] yes
[ ] no	[ ] no

19. If so, how are they communicated to accomplish this?

Workplace Readiness Student Assessment Consortium

Report of Discussion and Actions

October 26, 1991

Stanley Rabinowitz, Group Leader

Far West Educational Laboratory

Background

Under the auspices of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), state departments of education are being encouraged to establish and participate actively in student assessment consortia. To this end, a planning meeting was held on October 25, 1991 in Des Moines, Iowa. Representatives from more than 30 state education departments and other educational organizations attended the meeting. Participants were invited to form working groups in the areas of the Arts, History, Mathematics, Reading, Workplace Readiness, and Writing. These areas were identified on the basis of perceived interest level, need, past work carried out in the area, and the link to national assessment proposals.

The Workplace Readiness group consisted of representatives from American Samoa, Iowa, Maryland, Michigan, North Dakota, Texas, Wisconsin, the Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST), Far West Laboratory (FWL), and the National Conference of State Legislators. (Other states expressed a desire to work in this area but were unable to send a sufficient number of representatives to the meeting to participate in all areas of interest.) Each of these organizations is involved in the assessment of students' workplace readiness skills at a different point of development; thus, the group's discussion focused on a wide range of issues and needs.

Working Group Conclusion

Consensus was reached that much value can accrue from a Student Assessment Consortium examining the issues of developing and assessing

students' workplace readiness skills. Several conclusions were reached during group discussion, including:

- Much overlap exists in the definitions for workplace readiness proposed by state departments of education, educational and other organizations, and federal agencies. Many of the proposed outcomes appear consistent across states.
- Workplace readiness skills should be taught and assessed in the context of specific subject matter areas. Courses or assessments which focus on workplace readiness in an isolated, unintegrated fashion should *not* be developed.
- *Innovative* assessment procedures which follow this integrated approach towards measuring workplace readiness are highly desirable.
- States can benefit greatly from joint efforts in developing objectives for workplace readiness and in sharing materials and resources in the development of innovative (authentic) workplace readiness assessment tasks and activities.
- The greater the number of state departments of education and other educational and business organizations involved in this process, the more likely the consortium will be successful.

Future Goals

Two goals were identified by the group.

Goal 1: Develop a common core of workplace readiness objectives for state frameworks and assessments in workplace readiness;

Goal 2: Form a consortium among states for the joint development of innovative (authentic), integrated assessment tasks in workplace readiness.

To help accomplish both goals, the group recommended working with existing multi-state consortia which are attempting to define workplace readiness skills and develop innovative assessment techniques to measure these skills.

Next Steps

The working group concluded that accomplishing Goal 1 was essential to the eventual long term success of the Goal 2. Therefore, all states are invited to

participate in a meeting to begin the process of reaching a consensus for workplace readiness objectives. The meeting, scheduled for April 1992 concurrent to the AERA/NCME annual conference in San Francisco, will include the following activities:

- discussion among states of plans for the development and assessment of workplace readiness objectives;
- sharing among states of workplace readiness objectives already developed or in the process of being developed;
- presentations of several alternative definitions and models of workplace readiness.

All states, regardless of their level of involvement in this area, are encouraged to attend the April 1992 meeting.

For further information, contact Dr. Stanley Rabinowitz, senior associate at Far West Laboratory, 415-565-3030, who is serving as the facilitator of the workplace readiness Student Assessment Consortium.